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GOALS:
(i) Discuss some morpho-syntactic differences that have $v$ as its locus
(ii) Show that similar differences arise at the C layer of the clause
(iii) Consider some of the consequences

OUTLINE

1. Morpho-syntactic variation of $v$ across Romance
2. Morpho-syntactic variation of C across Romance (a quick look)
3. Sketching a parallel micro-parameter
4. Conclusions
1. Morpho-syntactic variation of $v$ across Romance


① VOS sentences: (i) object fronting or (ii) VP fronting

(1) a. Recogió cada coche, su propietario
   
   picked-up-3.SG each car its owner
   
   Its owner picked up each car

   b. *Hanno salutato Gianni, i propri genitori
   
   have-3.PL greeted Gianni the own parents
   
   His own parents have greeted Gianni

② VSO sentences

(2) a. O invita cam des Ion pe fata acesta
   
   CL-her invite-3.SG quite often Ion PE girl the-that
   
   Ion invites that girl quite often

   b. *Fullejava en Joan el diari
   
   browsed-3.SG the Joan the newspaper
   
   Joan was browsing the newspaper

③ Differential Object Marking (DOM)

(3) a. Il caut pe un student (Romanian) b. *J’ai vu a un enfant (French)
   
   CL_{ACC} seek PE a student I-have seen to a kid
   
   I’m looking for a student I have seen a kid
Oblique clitics

(4) a. J’en ai bu (French)  
    I-CL have drunk  
    I drank some  

b. Hi he viscut molt de temps (Catalan)  
    CL have lived a-lot of time  
    I have lived there for a long time

Leísmo: DAT instead of ACC

(5) a. Le vi (al niño) (European Spanish)  
    CL-DAT saw-1.SG the kid  
    I saw him

b. *Gli ho visto (Italian)  
    CL-DAT have seen  
    I have seen him

c. *Li he vist (Catalan)  
    CL-DAT have-1.SG seen  
    I have seen him

Laísmo: ACC instead of DAT

(6) a. La dije que Luis viene hoy (Central European Spanish)  
    CL-ACC said that Luis come today  
    I told her that Luis comes today

b. *La ho detto che Luigi viene oggi (Italian)  
    CL-ACC have said that Luigi come today  
    I have told her that Luigi comes today

Participial agreement

(7) a. Combien de tables as-tu repeintes? (French)  
    how-may of tables have-2.SG-you repainted-FEM.PL  
    How many tables did you repaint?

b. Jean les a repeintes (French)  
    Jean CL-FEM.PL have-3.SG repainted-FEM.PL  
    Jean has repainted them
a. Paolo le ha visto (le ragazzze) (Italian)
Paolo CL-FEM.PL have-3.SG seen-FEM.PL the girls
Paolo has seen them

b. Le ragazze que Paolo ha vista (*viste) (Italian)
the girls that Paolo have-3.SG seen-MASC.3.SG/FEM.3.PL
The girls that Paolo has seen

a. En Pau l’ ha trencada, la clau (Catalan)
the Pau CL-FEM.SG have-3.SG broken the key
Pau has broken it, the key

b. Quina clau ha trencat/*trencada, en Pau? (Catalan)
which key have-3.SG broken-MASC.3.SG/FEM.3.FEM, the Pau
Which key has Pau broken?

Possessive have / Auxiliary selection

a. Marie a le livre (French)
Marie have-3.SG the book
Marie has the book

b. Marie ha il libro (Italian)
Marie have-3.SG the book
Marie has the book

c. *María ha el libro (Spanish)
María have-3.SG the book
María has the book

a. *El tren és arribat (Catalan)
the train be-3.SG arrived
The train has arrived

b. *El verano es llegado (Spanish)
the summer be-3.SG arrived
Summer has arrived

c. Maria é arrivata (Italian)
Maria be-3.SG arrived-FEM.SG
Maria has arrived
Causative structures

(12)  

\[ a. \text{L-au facut (pe el) a compune piesa intr-o ora (Romanian)} \]

CL-ACC have made PE him to compose song-the in an hour

They made him compose the song for an hour [from Ciutescu 2012]

\[ b. \text{Hicimos a los chicos comprar los libros (European Spanish)} \]

made-1.PL to the boys buy the books

We made the boys buy the books [from Ordóñez 2008]

However, Catalan, Italian, French, and Río Plata Spanish preclude this position for the causee.

(13)  

\[ a. *\text{Pierre a fait a Jean ouvrir la porte (French)} \]

Pierre have made to Jean open the door

Pierre made Jean open the door [from Ordóñez 2008]

\[ b. *\text{Gianni fece a Daniele aprire la porta (Italian)} \]

Gianni made to Daniel open the door

Gianni made Daniel open the door [from Ordóñez 2008]

\[ c. *\text{En Joan a fet la Maria obrir la porta (Catalan)} \]

the Joan have made the Maria open the door

Joan made Maria open the door

\[ d. *\text{Hicimos a los chicos comprar los libros (Río de la Plata Spanish)} \]

made-1.PL to the boys buy the books

We made the boys buy the books [from Ordóñez 2008]

Clitic doubling with DPs

(14)  

\[ a. \text{Lo he visto a Juan (RiverPlate Spanish) b. *L’ he vist (a) en Joan (Catalan)} \]

CL have seen to Juan CL have seen to the Joan

I have seen Juan I have seen Joan

\[ c. *\text{Lo vedrò domani Gianni (Italian)} \]

CL will-see tomorrow Gianni

I have seen Juan

\[ d. *\text{Jean la connaït Marie (French)} \]

Jean CL know-3.SG Marie

I have seen Juan

Jean knows Marie
(15) Putting all the pieces together, the following picture emerges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WEST. ROMANCE</th>
<th>CENT. ROMANCE</th>
<th>EAST. ROMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Port.</td>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBLIQUE CL.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEÍSMO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAÍSMO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART. AGR.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX. SELEC.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL. DOUBLING</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUSEE + INF</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS. “HAVE”</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Morpho-syntactic variation of C across Romance


① Preposition + Complementizer

(16) a. Dudo [ de que María haya entendido el libro ] (Spanish)
    doubt of that María has understood the book
    I doubt María has understood the book

b. Dubto [ (*de que la María hagi entés el llibre] (Catalan)
    doubt of that the Maria has understood the book
    I doubt Maria has understood the book
V Encuentro Wedisyn
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (Madrid), March 24 – 25 2014

c. Dubito [(*d)i que tu abbia capito quel libro]  
I doubt of that you have understood that book

The pattern is analogous in nominal and adjectival environments:

(17) a. La posibilidad [CP de que venga] me preocupa  
the possibility of that come-SUBJ-3.SG me worries

The possibility that she comes worries me

b. Estoy cansado [CP de que te critiquen]  
be-1.SG tired of that you criticize-3.PL

I am tired that they criticize you

c. La possibilitat [CP (*de) que vingui] em preocupa  
the possibility of that come-SUBJ-3.SG me worries

The possibility that she comes worries me

d. Estic cansat [CP (*de) que et critiquin]  
be-1.SG tired of that you criticize-3.PL

I am tired that they criticize you

\(2\) De-queism

(18) a. Ana dijo [CP de que Juan se fue]  
Ana said of that Juan SE left

Ana said that Juan left

b. *L’ Anna va dir [CP de que en Joan se’n va anar]  
the Anna AUX say of that the Joan SE-CL AUX go

Ana said that Juan left

\(3\) Article + C

(19) a. (El) [CP que viniera] fue una sorpresa  
the that come was a surprise

The fact that he came was a surprise
Interestingly, this pattern is blocked in the context of P, even in Spanish:

(20)  a. Independientemente [PP de(*l) que estemos aquí ] (Spanish)
     independently of the that be-1.PL here
     Even though we are here

     b. Aparte [PP de(*l) que los datos fueran falsos ] (Spanish)
     apart of the that the data were false
     Apart from the fact that the data were false

The same holds with embedded interrogatives, which block the article too:

(21)   No sé [CP (*el) quién llamó ] (Spanish)
       not know-1.SG the who called
       I don’t know who called

③ C deletion

(22) a. Rogamos [CP ⊕ disculpen las molestias] (Spanish)
     pray-1.PL excuse-SUBJ-2.PL the inconvenientes
     We ask you to forgive any inconvenience

     b. Agradecemos [CP ⊕ entiendan la situación] (Spanish)
     thank-1.PL understand-SUBJ-2.PL the situation
     We thank you for understanding the situation’
This pattern is found in other Romance varieties (cf. Giorgi & Pianesi 2004 and references therein), but it is not so frequent. It is ruled out in Catalan.

(5) C deletion after C_REL.

(23) a. Una lectura [CP que espero [CP ∅ hayas entendido ]] (Spanish)
    A reading I hope you have understood
b. Una idea [CP que creo [CP ∅ nunca desarrollé ]] (Spanish)
    A idea I hope you have understood
c. *?Una persona [CP que trobo [CP ∅ hauries de conèixer ]] (Catalan)
    A person I believe you should meet
d. *?Un llibre [CP que penso [CP ∅ tindria èxit ]] (Catalan)
    A book I think would have success

3. Sketching a parallel micro-parameter

(24) The asymmetries discussed in section 1 plausibly have the category “v” (or some object-agreement related projection) as its locus (cf. D’Alessandro 2012, Gallego 2013, Torrego 1999, among others).
(25) Capitalizing on the first three asymmetries (DOM, Object Shift, and VSO) and the fact that they seem to be connected (Gallego 2013), I formalize this idea as follows, taking “v” to be associated with a functional category that is responsible for DOM, object shift (in VOS sentences), and VSO. I label such category “X.”

\[
{_{VP} \text{DP } v [_{XP} X [_{VP} V \text{DP } ] ]}
\]

Suppose now that X can be further parametrized:

a. \( X = \varphi \)-features
b. \( X = \text{prepositional (} \varphi \text{-less)} \)

(26) This idea aligns with Uriagereka’s (1995) study of the left periphery of Romance, which was subject to a syntactic parameter (the presence / absence of F) and a morphological one (the \( \varphi \)-endowment of F). I will assume so, pursuing a micro-parametric account of the facts that concern both \( v \) and C (cf. Biberauer 2008, Biberauer et al. 2010, Kayne 2000, Roberts 2008, etc.).

(27) Ideally, \( X \) (modulo morphological adjustment and syntactic placement; cf. D’Alessandro 2012, Torrego 1999, Uriagereka 1995) should account for the facts in (15).

\[
{_{VP} (X) [_{VP} \text{DP } v [_{XP} X [_{VP} V \text{DP } ] ] ]}
\]

(28) The presence of \( \varphi \)-features on \( X \) can account for DOM and object shift (both being A-related phenomena).

a. \( [_{VP} \text{OBJ } [_{VP} \text{SUBJ } v_{\varphi } [_{VP} V \text{tOBJ } ] ] ] \) \( X = \varphi \)-features (Romance A)
b. \( [_{VP} V \text{OBJ } [_{VP} \text{SUBJ } v_{\varphi } \text{tVP } ] ] \) \( X = \text{prepositional (Romance B)} \)

(29) The feature composition of \( v \) can be further related to clitic phenomena, assuming that \( v \) is the locus of internal argument clitics (cf. Torrego 1998, Roberts 2010).

a. \( [_{VP} \text{DP } v [_{XP} \varphi [_{VP} V \text{DP } ] ] ] \) oblique clitics in the morpho-phonology – NO
b. \( [_{VP} \text{DP } v [_{XP} \text{P } [_{VP} V \text{DP } ] ] ] \) oblique clitics in the morpho-phonology – YES
Leísmo is typically regarded as a gender / animacy marking strategy (Fernández-Ordóñez 1993, 1999, Romero 1997). Both lo and le are thus ACC clitics.

a. María vio a Juan → María {lo / le} vio (European Spanish)
   María saw-3.SG to Juan María CL-ACC/DAT saw-3.SG
   María saw Juan María saw him
b. María vio el coche → María {lo / *le} vio (European Spanish)
   María saw-3.SG the car María CL-DAT saw-3.SG
   María saw the car María saw it

Instead, suppose leísmo involves dativization of an ACC clitic. The dative status of le can be shown from the PCC effects (cf. Bonet 1995, Ormazabal & Romero 2007).

Entregué el prisionero al juez → Se {lo / *le} entregué
hand-over the prisoner to-the judge CLDAT CLACC CLDAT hand-over
I handed over the prisoner to the judge I handed him over to him (lit.)

Leísmo should be related to the “X = φ-features” parameter. This is possible if we analyze DOM as involving a complex VP structure (cf. Gallego 2007 and Torrego 2010).

a. María visitó a Juan (Spanish)
   María visited-3.SG to Juan
   María visited Juan
b. [vP María v [ X [ Juan [ P VISIT ] ] ] ]
   X = φ-complete Juan = ACC (non-leístas dialects)
   X = partially φ-defective Juan = DAT (leístas dialects)

Taking these considerations to be on track, let us assume the following:

Leísmo involves: ACC → DAT

Laísmo is typically regarded as gender motion. However, as Romero (1997, 2011) argues, this proposal predicts that laísmo should be found whenever datives are (passive, unaccusative, and psych verbs), but it is not:

(34)
With Romero (1997, 2011), I analyze laísmo as a Double Object Construction (DOC), whereby an IO is assigned ACC through dative shift. In brief:

Laísmo involves: \[ \text{DAT} \rightarrow \text{ACC} \]

Assuming a dependent approach to Case (Marantz 1991), where DAT is more complex than ACC (which in turn is more complex than NOM), all this means that if a dialect has leísmo then it can have laísmo (but see Andriani 2011).

The next question is why leísmo is absent in Catalan (and Romance B more generally). Under the analysis put forward here, it must follow from the fact that ACC cannot become DAT, which should also be related to the absence of DOM:

a. \([_{DP \dollar [ X \lbrack_{VP V \DP} \rbrack]}])\quad X = \varphi\text{-complete} \quad \text{(non-leísta Spanish / Romance A)}
\quad X = \text{partially } \varphi\text{-defective} \quad \text{(leísta Spanish / Romance A)}
\quad X = \text{completely } \varphi\text{-defective} \quad \text{(Romance B)}

The lack of \(\varphi\)-features in X for Romance B seems to be related to the possibility that dative clitics become locative. For Catalan, the connection as already been made by Bonet (1995, 2002), Mascaró (1985), Rigau (1978, 1982) and Roca (1992), and could be understood as taking \(li\) as \(l + \) (locative) \(bi\).
It is well-known that DAT is spelled-out as LOC in the presence of ACC (cf. Bonet 1994, 2008):

Donarem els diners a la Maria → Els {*li / hi} donarem

will-give-1.PL the money to the Maria

We will give the money to Maria

There are further contexts where Romance A DAT becomes PART in Romance B (cf. Roca 1992).

a. Los alumnos se ríen de María → Los alumnos se le ríen (Spanish)

the students SE laugh of María

The students laugh at María

b. Els alumnes se ’n ruien (de la Maria) (Catalan)

the students SE of-her laugh of the Maria

The students laugh at her [from Roca 1992]

The same analysis should carry over to C (cf. Torrego 2011, 2013 for related ideas):

\[
[XP (X) [CP C [XP (X) . . . ]]]
\]

X = \( \varphi \)-features

X = prepositional (\( \varphi \)-less)
The general picture (cf. D’Alessandro 2012, Biberauer et al. 2010, Torrego 1999, a.o.).

*where is X?*

-around (above/below) “C”- around (above/below) “v”-

- [Left Periphery / IP area]

- is X prepositional? 

- NO

- YES

- *Is ϕ below or above v?*

- ABOVE

- BELOW

- [E.Port./Galician]

- ϕ-complete

- ϕ-defective

- [R.P.Spanish/Romanian]

- ♦ clitic doubling

- ♦ laísmo

- ♦ leísmo

- [Italian] [French]

- AUX selection

- ♦ poss. have

- [Mex. Spanish]

- leísmo

- leísmo

- (♦ laísmo) (♦ laísmo)
4. Conclusions

We have seen different pieces of evidence suggesting the presence of micro-parametric cuts that have an object-agreement projection as its locus. We have dubbed this projection $X$, assuming it is related to $v$.

$$[_{\varepsilon P} (X) [_{\varepsilon P} DP v [_{\varepsilon P} (X) [_{\varepsilon P} V DP ] ] ] ]$$

We know that $X$ must be related to $v$ somehow, but the precise mechanism has been left open here (bundling, phrasal spell-out, splitting, inheritance etc.; Chomsky 2008, Pollock 1989, Starke 2010).

The nature of $X$ can vary across Romance. In some languages (Romance A), it has a purely agreement nature. In others (Romance B), a prepositional one.
We also know that the precise syntactic placement of X can change (cf. D’Alessandro 2012, Torrego 1999).

Interestingly, different facts suggest the existence of similar facts in the CP layer (cf. Torrego 2011, 2013).
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